DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 745 HE 013 995

AUTHOR Wilson, Lucy R.: Mandell, Alan
TITLE Faculty Evaluation and Reward.
PUB DATE [81]
NOTE 14p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty: Compensation (Remuneration): Evaluation Criteria: *Faculty Evaluation: Faculty Promotion: Higher Education: Merit Pay: *Merit Rating: Models: Productivity: *Recognition (Achievement): Rewards: Scholarship: *Teacher Effectiveness: Teacher Responsibility: *Teacher Salaries

ABSTRACT

The need for objectivity in evaluating faculty is briefly addressed, and a model by which professional activities may be quantified is presented. A list of possible activities ranked in groups of equal point value, by which faculty can generate merit points, is presented. An attempt was made to equalize the potential point production values in each of the three generally recognized areas: teaching, research (publications), and professional service. Baselines (activity levels expected as normal professional behavior) were established for certain of the activities; merit point production in those cases would be based on additional activities above the established baselines. Guidelines for processing the faculty evaluation model, and recommendations for equitably distributing monies available as salary increases are presented. An illustration of translating faculty production points into monetary rewards is included. It is suggested that with real and pending budget cuts in higher education, the necessity for distinguishing between excellent and mediocre faculty productivity has become more evident, and that faculty need clear guidelines as to what is expected to them and what rewards are possible for genuine performance. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED203745

Faculty Evaluation and Reward

by

Lucy R. Wilson and Alan Mandell

This paper discusses the need for objectivity in evaluating faculty, and offers a model by which professional activities may be quantified. The model includes activities within teaching, research and service that are deserving of recognition, offers a rating system for such activities, and suggests alternatives for rewarding faculty on the basis of monies available to the school.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lucy R Wilson
Alan Mandell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE013 995

Dr. Wilson is Associate Dean and Professor of Education at Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia. Dr. Mandell is Professor of Education at the same institution. Some items included in the model were suggested by Dr. Melvin Williams, Eminent Professor of Health and Physical Education at ODU.

Faculty Evaluation and Reward

Introduction

Historically, institutions of higher education have conformed to a traditional, "holistic" approach to rewarding faculty achievement. Most faculty have expected and received salary increments, released time, and travel funds without benefit of a systematic, objective appraisal of the faculty member's entitlement. Efforts to reward on the basis of merit often have been based on an intuitive and subjective appraisal of faculty productivity.

In an effort to establish an objective mechanism for determining faculty rewards, the Dean of the Darden School of Education, Old Dominion University, established a Faculty Rewards Task Force to "identify activities within teaching, research, and service that are deserving of recognition; develop a rating system for such activities; and to specify appropriate rewards" (October, 1980).

Philosophically, the Dean and the Task Force agreed that the evaluation system should be designed to propagate faculty development, as well as to serve the immediate function of facilitating decisions on salary increases. They agreed also that although primary consideration should be given to monetary rewards, other kinds of rewards (e.g., plaques, certificates, release time, travel, etc.) should be included in the Task Force's recommendations.

Assumptions

Before beginning its work, the Task Force formulated ten assumptions to guide its efforts in carrying out the charge.

Table 1. Assumptions

1.	Levels of performance vary among faculty in kind, quality, and quantity.
2.	Although not all worthwhile faculty activities can be evaluated, high levels of performance can be identified and quantified.
3.	Tangible productivity must be the primary criterion for determining quality of performance.
4.	Tangible, high-quality performance deserves greater rewards than low or mediocre performance.
5.	Recommendations made by the Task Force shall not conflict with existing policies of the School nor the University.
6.	The evaluation process must include input from the faculty member concerned, his/her department chairperson, and the Dean of the School.
7.	Recommendations of the Faculty Rewards Task Force will pertain to teaching faculty only.
8.	Activities included in the evaluation model must be accessible to every member of the faculty.
9.	The model must be distributed to and discussed with faculty for appropriate input and revised before implementation.
10.	After revision, the model must be pilot-tested prior to implementation in the fall semester, 1981.

The Task Force's work was facilitated by the acceptance of these assumptions of the outset, but more important, it gave confidence to the faculty that the Task Force would operate openly and honestly in the interest of the faculty and the School.

Table 2 provides a list of possible activities ranked in groups of equal point value, by which faculty can generate merit points. The Task Force attempted to equalize the potential point production values in each of the three generally recognized areas: teaching, research (publications), and professional service. Baselines (activity levels expected as normal professional behavior) were established for certain of the activities; merit point production in those cases would be based on additional activities above the established baselines.

Table 2. Suggested Activities and Weightings

For each activity, Total = (Number of Activities less Baseline) x Point Value

POINT VALUE = 1

Activity	Baseline	Number of Activities	Total
Committee membership in school or department			
Committee membership at university or state level			
Offices held or committees chaired at school, department or university level			
Consultantship at local level			
Proposals submitted at school/ departmental level			
Dissertation or Guidance Committee, member			
Chairperson's Evaluation: (Maximum point value = 5)			_____

POINT VALUE = 2

Activity	Baseline	Number of Activities	Total
Major departmental level report			
Attendance at workshops, seminars, clinics, conventions, or other such gatherings relative to increasing knowledge or teaching ability			
Presentation at workshop, conference or professional activity at local level			
Leadership or coordination of workshops, conferences, and professional activities at state level			

Table 2. Suggested Activities and Weightings (continued)

POINT VALUE = 2 cont.

Activity	Baseline	Number of Activities	Total
Offices held or committees chaired at state level			
Consultantship at state level			
Problem chair (Course No. 636)			
Sponsorship of student professional activity			
Publication in newsletter			
Proposal funded at school or departmental level			
Multiple course preparation per calendar year			
Chairperson's Evaluation: (Maximum point value = 5)			_____

POINT VALUE = 3

Activity	Baseline	Number of Activities	Total
Proposals submitted at the university level			
Major university or school level report			
Publication in non-refereed regional or state journal			
Outreach program/non-credit courses			
Committee membership at the regional or national level			
Presentation at state meeting			
Chairperson's Evaluation: (Maximum point value = 5)			_____

Table 2. Suggested Activities and Weightings (continued)

POINT VALUE = 4

Activity	Baseline	Number of Activities	Total
Development of novel curricular methods and materials or courses to improve teaching			
Development of new programs			
Proposals submitted at regional or state level			
Proposal funded at the university			
Leadership or coordination of workshops, conferences, and professional activities at the regional (multi-state) level			
Member of editoral board of journal or newsletter			
Chairperson's Evaluation: (Maximum point value = 5)			_____

POINT VALUE = 5

Activity	Baseline	Number of Activities	Total
Publication in non-refereed national journal			
Publication in refereed regional/ state journal			
Consultantship at regional level			
Presentation at regional meeting			
Offices held or committee chaired at regional level			
Non-degree coursework taken to improve teaching			
Dissertation or Guidance Committee, chair			
Chairperson's Evaluation: (Maximum point value = 5)			_____

Table 2. Suggested Activities and Weightings (continued)

POINT VALUE = 6

Activity	Baseline	Number of Activities	Total
Proposals submitted at national/ international level			
Presentation at national or international meeting			
Chairperson's Evaluation: (Maximum point value = 5)			_____

POINT VALUE = 7

Activity	Baseline	Number of Activities	Total
Consultantship at national level			
Office held or committee chaired at national level			
Editor of journal or newsletter			
Chapter in edited text			
Revision of existing book in feild of endeavor			
Chairperson's Evaluation: (Maximum point value = 5)			_____

POINT VALUE = 8

Activity	Baseline	Number of Activities	Total
Editor of book			
Publication in refereed national journal			
Leadership or coordination of workshops, conferences, and professional activities at national level			
Chairperson's Evaluation: (Maximum point value = 5)			_____

Table 2. Suggested Activities and Weightings (continued)

POINT VALUE = 9

Activity	Baseline	Number of Activites	Total
Publication of books--(non-"Vanity" publishing house or association, distribution outside of regional area)			
*Average student rating of greater than 80% in all courses taught			
Major report for government agency or professional organization			
Chairperson's Evaluation: (Maximum point value = 5)			_____

POINT VALUE = 10

Activity	Baseline	Number of Activities	Total
Publication of books--(non-"Vanity" publishing house or association, national and/or international distributors)			
Proposal funded at regional/state level			
Proposal funded at national or international level			
Chairperson's Evaluation: (Maximum point value = 5)			_____
		TOTAL POINTS--ALL ACTIVITIES	_____

* 4.00 - 4.75 = 9 pts.
4.75 - 5.00 = 18 pts.

Guidelines for Processing the Faculty Evaluation Model

1. Definition of terms:

   Baseline. The number of activities expected of all faculty as a normal part of the professional function.

   Number of Activities. Actual count of activities above baseline performance.

   Total. The number of activities times the point value for the category.

   Chairperson's Evaluation. (a) The chairperson's assessment of the quality of the faculty member's performance within each point value category indicated; and (b) the chairperson's assessment of the faculty member's performance of activities not included in the faculty evaluation model, such as results of a second teaching evaluation procedure, student recruitment, number of advisees, number of honor and independent study courses taught, and sponsorship of non-professional student activities (i.e., cheerleaders). The chairperson may assign a maximum value of 5 to each Point Value Category or a total value of 50 for all categories included in the evaluation model. Points assigned by the chairperson are in addition to those shown under Number of Activities.

2. The total for each point value category is found by multiplying the Number of Activities (above baseline) by the point value assigned to the category, and adding to that product the point value assigned by the chairperson.

3. The total point value for all activities equals the sum total of all point value categories.

4. Completion of the Faculty Evaluation form is the joint responsibility of the faculty member and the chairperson. The chairperson may exercise one of the following options:

   a. Allow the faculty member to initiate the completion of the form by indicating the number of activities engaged in within each category and the totals appropriate for each activity. The chairperson completes the process by assigning a point value (maximum point value = 5) for each activity category and totaling all points for all activities.

   b. Complete the form on the basis of the faculty member's self-evaluation.

   For either option, both the chairperson and the faculty member must sign the completed evaluation verifying the accuracy of the report.

Distribution of Monies Available

After the faculty evaluation sheets have been completed and collected, the Dean must have an equitable method of distributing the monies available as salary increases. The Task Force made these recommendations:

(1) that fifty percent of the monies available for salary increases be distributed on the basis of existing criteria for the chairpersons' evaluations.

(2) that the remaining fifty percent be distributed on the basis of merit as established by the faculty point production totals.

The Task Force identified two possible alternatives for this second step and cited the implications of each.

(a) For faculty producing equivalent merit point totals, allot merit raise as a percentage of existing faculty salaries.

Implications: equal meritorious performance (point production) is rewarded equally on a <u>percentage</u> basis

: equal meritorious performance is unequally rewarded on a dollar basis.

(b) For faculty producing equivalent merit point totals, allot merit raise of equal dollar amounts.

Implications: equal dollar awards for equal point production

: lower salaried staff receive greater <u>percentage</u> of existing salary awards than higher salaried staff for equivalent point production.

The Task Force provided a model suggesting how either of these two procedures might be used to translate faculty production points into monetary rewards.

Processing the Completed Faculty Forms

1. Arrange faculty evaluation sheets from highest to lowest points earned.

2. Distribute the sheets into categories based on point spreads. (The categories may be different each year depending upon faculty productivity.)

3. Value rank each category from highest to lowest by a number series. (For example, if there were ten categories, the top category would get a value of ten; the lowest, a value of one.)

4. Divide the average point value of each category by the total number of points generated by the faculty to obtain a percentage weight for each category.

5. Multiply the percentage weight by the number of faculty in the category times the rank value assigned that category. This defines the percent of money available for raises within that category.

Table 3 illustrates how the above approach may be applied.

Table 3. Model Example

Assumptions: Senior staff (capital letters) all make $30,000; junior staff (lower case letters) all make $15,000. Amount available for merit raises is $10,000.

Staff Member	Pres. Salary	Points Earned	Category Rank	Avg. Pts./ Category	%Wt.	Product	Option 1 Raise	Option 2 Raise
A	30,000	1000					1767	2650
				(1)	(2)	(3) (4)		
b	15,000	940	4	953	.39	1.56(53%)	1767	1325
c	15,000	920						
		2860					1767	1325
							5300(5)	5300
d	15,000	800					1033	775
e	15,000	760	3	756	.31	.93(31%)	1033	775
F	30,000	710					1033	1550
		2270					3100	3100
G	30,000	600					467	700
h	15,000	580	2	570	.24	.42(14%)	467	350
i	15,000	530					467	350
		1710					1400	1400
J	30,000	350	1	350	.05	.05(05%)	200	200
						2.96(100%)		
		7190					$10,000	

(1) $\frac{2860}{7190} = 953$ (2) $\frac{953}{7190} \times \frac{(3FAC) = .39}{\text{in category}}$

(3) .39 x 4 (category rank) = 1.56 (4) $\frac{1.56}{2.96} = 53\%$ (5) 53% of 10,000 = $5,300

NOTE: ALL NUMBERS ROUNDED OFF

Summary

With real and pending budget cuts in higher education, the necessity for distinguishing between excellent and mediocre faculty productivity has become more evident. But as distinctions are drawn, faculty must have clear guidelines as to what is expected of them and what rewards are in the offing for genuine performance. As a group, faculty are very different individuals needing a variety of incentives and opportunities to extend their potential. New approaches must be found to encourage their continued development, renewal, and evaluation. The faculty evaluation model described here is one example of such an approach.